

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

REMARKS

This current Reply is responsive to a current and Non-final Office Action dated (mailed) 06/07/2006. This current Office Action examined claims 1-26.

Generally, the current Office Action rejected claims 1-26.

Specifically, the rejection was as follows (from pages 2 and 3):

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess. (US 6,192,512).

As per claims 1-26, Chess teaches a system for processing command line input, the system comprising: a command line interface comprising a set of executable commands; and a command line processor for, at least; parsing the command line input; identifying one or more macros within the input, expanding the one or more macros into at least one executable command of the command line interface, and executing the commands independent of compilation.

(Abstract, cols.2-8)

Chess teaches the use of interpreters that are often embedded inside application program subsystems for a specific language in which the word processor macros are written. Chess teaches a macro with an application program subsystem, having a macro interpreter, so as to detect a presence of potential viral activity. The method includes the steps of: (a) making an API call with a program, the API call identifying the macro and specifying an initial virtual environment within which the macro is to be interpreted; (b) interpreting in turn individual instructions of the macro; (c) altering the virtual environment in response to interpreted instructions; and (d) notifying the program upon the occurrence of an alteration to the virtual environment that triggers a predetermined notification criterion. The step of notifying the program can also take place upon the occurrence of the interpretation of the macro triggering a predetermined termination criterion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that Chess teaches the use of interpreters that expand the macro - line by line -before compilation into an executable file.

1  
2 No claims are canceled or added by this Reply. Hence, claims 1-26 are  
3 presented for examination. Of claims 1-26, claims 1, 9, and 15 are independent.  
4

5  
6 It is believed that the claims were allowable in their previous forms.  
7 However, to facilitate prosecution and expedite the ultimate allowance of the  
8 Instant Patent Application, certain claims have been amended as indicated above.

9 These amendments more clearly evidence the differences between the  
10 applied art (e.g., Chess) and the claimed invention. The independent claims now  
11 read as follows.

12 Claim 1 reads, in pertinent part, **expanding the macro by replacing the**  
13 **macro with an executable command of the command line interface, the**  
14 **executable command comprising a string.**

15 Claim 9 reads, in pertinent part, **expanding the macro by replacing the**  
16 **macro with an executable command of a command line interface, the**  
17 **executable command comprising a string.**

18 Claim 15 reads, in pertinent part, **expanding the one or more macros by**  
19 **replacing the one or more macros with at least one executable command of**  
20 **the command line interface, the at least one executable command comprising**  
21 **at least one string.**  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 Chess (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,512) does not render the pending claims  
2 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103.

3  
4  
5 A. The “macro” of Chess does not correspond to the macro of the  
6 pending claims.

7  
8 1. The “macro” of Chess corresponds to an executable program.

9 This is evidenced, for example, by the following portions of Chess:

10 A computer application program subsystem (100) includes a program  
11 interpreter (120) and an application program interface (API 110) through which  
12 an external program requests an *execution of a program of interest, such as a*  
13 *macro*, in a specified simulated environment.

14 (*italicized emphasis added*; Chess; Abstract, First Five Lines)

15 A method is disclosed for exercising a macro with an application  
16 program subsystem, having a macro interpreter, so as to detect a presence of  
17 potential viral activity. The method includes the steps of: (a) making an API call  
18 with a program, the API call identifying the macro and specifying an initial  
19 virtual environment within which the macro is to be interpreted; *(b) interpreting*  
20 *in turn individual instructions of the macro*; (c) altering the virtual environment  
21 in response to interpreted instructions; and (d) notifying the program upon the  
22 occurrence of an alteration to the virtual environment that triggers a  
23 predetermined notification criterion.

24 (*italicized emphasis added*; Chess; Column 2, Lines 42-52)

25 A *program of interest, such as a macro* written in a language that the  
interpreter is capable of interpreting, is passed through the virtual API 110 from  
an external program (i.e., a program that exists outside of the application  
program subsystem 100.)

(*italicized emphasis added*; Chess; Column 5, Lines 17-21)

1  
2           2.     In contrast, each **macro** of the pending claims is an input line,  
3     or portion thereof, for a command line interface. Consequently, the  
4     “macro” of Chess can not be used to anticipate or render obvious the **macro**  
5     of the pending claims.

6  
7  
8           B.     The “macro” of Chess is not replaced; consequently, it can not be  
9     replaced by a **string**, as in the pending claims.

10  
11           1.     The “macro” of Chess does not appear to be replaced.

12           A review of Chess indicates that its “macros” are executed or interpreted.  
13     They are not replaced.

14  
15           2.     In contrast, each **macro** of the pending claims is replaced by  
16     an **executable command**, which comprises a **string**, during the expansion  
17     of the **macro**. Because, Chess does not describe or suggest replacing a  
18     macro with a string, it can not be used to anticipate or render obvious the  
19     pending claims.

1        C. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the pending claims 1-26 are  
2        patentable over Chess.

3  
4        It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims 1-26 are patentable over  
5        Chess because (A) the “macro” of Chess does not correspond to the **macro** of the  
6        pending claims and (B) the “macro” of Chess is not replaced by a **string**.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11                    Dependent Claims

12  
13        Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 9, and 15 have been  
14        provided above. Claims 2-8/22-26, 10-14, and 16-21 depend directly or indirectly  
15        from these independent claims 1, 9, and 15, respectively. Although each also  
16        includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability, these dependent claims  
17        are allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection with their respective  
18        independent claims.

## CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of claims 1-26 are allowable. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to pass the instant Patent Application to issue.

However, if the Examiner determines that there are any remaining issues that preclude the issuance of a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to schedule an Interview prior to issuing another Office Action, in accordance with the accompanying PTOL-413A: Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 11/7/2006

By: Keith W. Saunders  
Keith W. Saunders  
Reg. No. 41,462  
(509) 324-9256 x238